

Mr. PETER moved that the Convention adjourn until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT ruled that motion out of order.

The question being taken upon the motion to adjourn, it was agreed to; and

The PRESIDENT declared the Convention adjourned until half-past four o'clock.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Convention assembled at half past four o'clock, P. M.

The roll was called and the following members answered to their names:

Messrs. Goldsborough, President; Abbott, Annan, Baker, Belt, Berry, of Prince George's, Blackiston, Brown, Carter, Cunningham, Cushing, Daniel, Davis, of Washington, Dellinger, Duvall, Earle, Ecker, Farrow, Gale, Galloway, Greene, Harwood, Hebb, Hoffman, Hopkins, Hopper, Horsey, Jones, of Somerset, Keefer, Kennard, Lee, Marbury, McComas, Mitchell, Miller, Mullikin, Murray, Negley, Nyman, Parker, Robbinette, Sands, Schley, Schlosser, Scott, Smith, of Carroll, Smith, of Worcester, Sneary, Stirling, Sykes, Thruston, Todd, Turney, Wood—54.

#### SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

Mr. SCOTT submitted the following order: *Ordered*, That the President be authorized to appoint a person to act as Sergeant-at-Arms, temporarily, who shall receive the pay of the present incumbent while acting in his place.

Mr. MILLER. Does that mean that the pay of the present Sergeant-at-Arms is to be stopped during the time of the new appointment?

Mr. SCOTT. Of course. It expressly says "the pay of the present incumbent."

Mr. HARWOOD moved to amend by striking out the latter clause, "the pay of the present incumbent while acting in his place," and inserting "\$5 per day."

The amendment was rejected.

The order was adopted.

The PRESIDENT appointed, in compliance therewith, John T. Wright, temporary Sergeant-at-Arms for to-day and such other days as the Sergeant-at-Arms may be absent.

#### DECLARATION OF RIGHTS—ALLEGIANCE.

The Convention resumed the consideration of the order of the day which had been informally postponed, being the second reading of the Declaration of Rights; the pending question being upon the amendment of Mr. BRISCOE, to strike out "paramount" before "allegiance" in the fourth article.

Mr. MARBURY. The great Daniel Webster, who has been so often quoted in this Convention, said very beautifully in one of his eloquent speeches, that—

"This is a Union, and not a consolidation of States;"

"Not chaos-like together crushed and bruised,  
But like the world harmoniously confused,  
Where order in variety we see,  
And where, though all things differ, all agree."

I agree with that great statesman that this is a Union, and not a consolidation of States. Not to review the whole history of this doctrine of sovereignty, which I am very glad to be relieved of by the able exposition of that subject, which has already been given by a number of gentlemen upon this floor, but simply referring to the facts that in the colonial history of this country, from the establishment of their independence, from the very day when the Declaration of Independence itself was in the course of preparation, a plan was on foot for the purpose of connecting the States or colonies then in existence, a plan recognizing in as clear a manner as any proposition could recognize, that they were to be separate, sovereign and independent States. Following up that history to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, we find the same fact admitted by all parties, that there could be no Constitution of the United States, even without a full, fair recognition of the sovereignty, the independence and the equality of the States. These are facts of history. They are facts which never upon this floor or in any other assembly in the United States, have been refuted. This government is formed of coequal States; and equality is the very corner stone and foundation of this government. Destroy that equality and you destroy the very foundation and corner stone of the government itself.

Yet, sir, to-day there is a proposition to incorporate in the bill of rights of the State of Maryland, for the first time in the history of this country, a provision, which in my humble opinion, would at once destroy this recognized doctrine of the equality of the States. The internal evidence of the Constitution itself shows that the States, the smallest of them, and the humblest of them, were upon a perfect equality with the largest. If you once admit this doctrine of the equality of the States, and allow States possessing far less population, far less wealth, to stand equally with the most populous and most wealthy, under the shelter of the Constitution of the United States, you can come to no other conclusion than that there must be some inherent power, some great sovereign element in those States giving them a right to that recognition of equality. What other plea could they have had for putting Rhode Island upon an equal footing with the great States of New York and Virginia, than the idea that they represented a great solid principle that lay as the keystone of the government. Those States were sovereign in the beginning. They have